

Atty. Dkt. No. 048772-1201
(formerly 2291P)

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 3, 5-24, 26, 28, 30, 32-48 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 10, 15-17, 28, 30, 32-33, 37 and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,460,041 to Lloyd (hereinafter "Lloyd") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0198878 to Baxter et al. (hereinafter "Baxter") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,352 to Cohen (hereinafter "Cohen"). Further, claims 7-9, 11-14, 18-24, 26, 34-36, 38-41 and 44-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd, Baxter and Cohen, and further in view of Lemay. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

As noted in an earlier paper, embodiments of the present invention allow construction of a "database driven website" where each web page is stored as a database record having fields that reference various parameters, such as page-type. A page-type may correspond to an application object, such as a calculator, calendar, web mail, catalog or a guestbook, for example. Each of independent claims 1, 10, 18, 24, 28, 37 and 44 recite that "each page-type correspond[s] to an application object."

While the Examiner acknowledges that Lloyd does not specifically disclose "each page-type corresponding to an application object," the Office Action alternately asserts that either Cohen or Baxter discloses this feature. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Cohen discloses "allowing a user to specify a page-type, each page-type corresponding to an application object." In rejecting claim 10, the Office Action asserts that Baxter discloses "each page type corresponding to an application object." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Baxter and Cohen and submits that neither Baxter nor Cohen nor any other reference teaches or suggests the above-noted feature of the pending claims.

Atty. Dkt. No. 048772-1201
(formerly 2291P)

With regards to Cohen, Applicant again notes that the cited sections of Cohen disclose a scripting program which allows a higher-order level of instructions embedded within a script with a set of new delimiters. The instructions do not teach or suggest the use of an application object to be invoked. In fact, nowhere does Cohen describe invoking an application object corresponding to a page-type parameter.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office Action asserts that the "conversion of an AST to an ASP is the conversion of application objects in the AST to a corresponding page-type, ASP, when the conversion is invoked." Thus, the Examiner analogizes the AST file to a page-type and the ASP to an application object. Neither of these analogies is accurate. With regard to the page type, the page type of the pending claims is a parameter. The use of a parameter allows reduced material in the template, while the actual application object corresponding to the page type may be stored elsewhere. In sharp contrast, the AST file disclosed in Cohen itself contains scripting code. See e.g., Cohen, col. 5, lines 13-14. Thus, the AST file is not a parameter akin to the page type of the pending claims. Therefore, Cohen fails to teach or suggest at least that feature of the independent claims.

With regard to Baxter, the Examiner cites Baxter as disclosing the above-noted feature at paragraphs [0006] and [0013]. Even a cursory reading of the cited portions of Baxter reveals the lack of any teaching or suggestion of the claimed feature. Nowhere do the cited portions of Baxter disclose any page-type parameter or any application object. Applicant is unclear as to what aspect of Baxter the Examiner believes discloses this feature.

Thus, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 10, 18, 24, 28, 37 and 44 are patentable. Claims 3, 5 and 6-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 11-16 depend from allowable claim 10, claims 19-23 depend from allowable claim 18, claim 26 depends from allowable claim 24, claims 30 and 32-36 depend from allowable claim 28, claims 38-43 depend from allowable claim

Atty. Dkt. No. 048772-1201
(formerly 2291P)

37 and claims 45-48 depend from allowable claim 44. Therefore, claims 11-16, 19-23, 26, 30, 32-36, 38-43 and 45-48 are patentable for at least that reason.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 13, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
P.O. Box 80278
San Diego, California 92138-0278
Telephone: (858) 847-6860
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

By Sanjeev K. Dhand

Sanjeev K. Dhand
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,182